

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/089,694	04/03/2002	Akihiko Sano	0020-4976 P	5505	
2292	7590 12/15/2006		EXAMINER		
	EWART KOLASCH &	TRAN, S	TRAN, SUSAN T		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		7	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•	,		1615		

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/089,694	SANO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Susan T. Tran	1615		

	Susan T. Tran	1615					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	ving replies: (1) an amendment, at tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply many of the final rejection.	ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C sust be filed within one	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following				
b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final rejecti	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing d	of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th					
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NC w);	TE below);					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 6-12.	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ w rided below or appended.	ill be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			.,				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see continuation.	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	All	m				
		Susan T. Tran Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1615					

Art Unit: 1615

## Continuation

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's request for reconsideration filed 11/09/06 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the composition of Dunn is in liquid form, and not as a solid as being claimed. However, it is noted that nowhere in the specification or in the claims, the limitation "solid composition" is required. The term "cure" does not necessitate the composition to be a "solid" composition. In contrast to the applicant's argument, Dunn teaches a solid composition through the patent, see for example column 4, lines 7-8, the composition and resulting solid implant; and column 12, lines 53-55, a solid implant can also be formed from the nonpolymeric composition outside the body of the animal and then inserted as a solid matrix. Accordingly, Dunn teaches a solid composition.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Dunn and Fujioka, because Dunn teaches a non-polymeric composition. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Fujioka is relied upon solely for the teaching of silicone elastomer as a carrier. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of

Application/Control Number: 10/089,694

Art Unit: 1615

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dunn and Jujioka, because Fujioka teaches silicone elastomer can provide an effective level of release over a long period of time (columns 1 and 2), and because Dunn desires for a delivery system that provides a sustained release rate of bioactive agent. Furthermore, in response to the applicant's argument that Dunn does not teach the use of polymer, applicant's attention is called to the teaching of cellulose-based polymer and the like (column 3, line 6); and water-insoluble polymer (column 11, lines 35-52).

Page 3

W/) M/ AU1615